

Amherst Charter Commission meeting of April 6, 2017, Town Hall Town Room

Members present: Andy Churchill, Meg Gage, Nick Grabbe, Tom Fricke, Mandi Jo Hanneke, Irv Rhodes, Julia Rueschemeyer, Diana Stein, Gerry Weiss.

Collins Center: Michael Ward.

Public in attendance: Jerry Guidera, Michael Greenebaum, Alice Swift, Michael Hanke, Kitty Axelson-Berry, Melissa Giraud, Adrienne Terrizzi, Ted Parker, Karla Rasche, Hwei-Ling Greeney, Maurianne Adams, Alisa Brewer, Janet Keller, Jackie Churchill, Claudia Brown, Janet McGowan, Shevan Best, Josh Hornick, Bob Greeney, Christopher Riddle, Markus Smith, Michael Albert.

Agenda

1. Call to order, approve agenda, approve minutes (5 minutes)
2. Discussion of charter articles with Collins Center (40 minutes)
3. Discussion of potential alternatives to currently proposed mayor/council structure (45 minutes)
4. Public comment (15 minutes)
5. Discussion and vote on potential alternatives to currently proposed mayor/council structure (15 minutes)
6. Continue discussion of charter articles (1 hour, 45 minutes)
7. Planning/updates (15 minutes)
8. Topics not reasonably anticipated by the Chair 48 hours prior to the meeting
9. Adjourn

The meeting was called to order at 5:30 pm.

Ward explained the discussion possibilities. Began by reviewing the Potential Options for Additional General Provisions Sections document.

Ward: The “in every year ending in question mark,” implies a 10-year review. Some do a 5-year review.

Gage: Where do we write the scope of what can be reviewed and changed without a charter and where do we write in the charter if we want to influence what those things are?

Ward: Some things are spelled out in 43b in the overall procedures chapter. Some things are constrained by state law. It’s case by case of what you might put in a transition provisions. The size of school committee or legislative branch for example would not be easily changed and have to go through a charter change procedure. Can double check.

Churchill: What is the purpose of this review if it’s not to actually propose changes to the charter?

Ward: It’s a much shorter process. Major change is not going to come at the review.

Churchill: If we had a council of 13 and the group wanted to propose changing it to 11 or 9, that’s not going to come out of this review process?

Ward: I believe it could, but it would definitely need to go back to the ballot for sure.

Churchill: So the council could say that we recommend this or that we turn it over to the voters?

Ward: Will double check.

Hanneke: *Reads Section 10a of Chapter 43.* The charter commission is the only way you can change the size of the legislative body.

Ward: This is a very common provision.

Gage: In the charter does it have to say a number for the size of the council?

Ward: Generally, it has to be a specific number.

Rueschemeyer: Question about the word voter. Do you need to have the word “voter” or can you have “resident?”

Ward: We can flag that.

Gage: We had an interesting comment yesterday, asking us that the charter not use the word “citizen,” but use the word “resident” or “voter.”

Churchill: Would like to propose the idea of the first review being 5 years out, then 10 years after that.

Hanneke: Would like it to be every 5 years.

Churchill: What is the likely transition period?

Ward: It would be problematic to have it during the same time as a state election. You could have it after the Fall election of 2018 or hold it the Spring of 2019.

Churchill: So 5 years after the first election in 2019?

Hanneke: Let's go with 2020 and 2025. *Agreed by everyone.* My preference is that the council provides for the review, not the mayor or manager, but the legislative branch.

Churchill: What does it mean to provide for the review? Do they organize it? Do they appoint the committee?

Ward: The way it's framed here is that the bylaws will have to specify that it's the council who will decide who is on the committee.

Churchill asks if anyone has any problems with the council providing it. No disagreement.

Stein: Having looked at a number of city websites, I've noticed that the charter reviews don't usually happen. Suggests making it optional. Thinking of a website with info posted, where there are lists of multiple years.

Churchill: Was talking with someone from East Longmeadow. Soon after their charter passed and a new government was put in place, they had a new bylaw review. Is that the timeline that we are looking at?

Ward: 10 or 5 is best. It's better to have bylaw reviews a couple years after the charter review. You would want to do one relatively soon, within a year or two.

Hanneke: Suggestion of reviewing half of the bylaws every 3 or 5 years to be more manageable. Have you seen that in other charters anywhere?

Ward: No, but intriguing idea to lower the level of expectation, because the bylaws can be 50-200 pages. That's something to consider.

Discussing pages of bylaws.

Churchill: Maybe every 10 years and the council can decide how to divide it up?

Ward: Bylaws will continue unless they conflict with the new charter. If it conflicts, the charter still proceeds.

Stein: When I go look at some webpages, it seems like this provision of their charter is disregarded. Could the council decide that there's no need for a charter review?

Ward: Yes, they could, but it would be in violation.

Hanneke: Would propose a rewording.

Churchill: At the end of last meeting we had a discussion about concerns among members that we should try one more time to see if we can arrive at a consensus about the commission getting behind a form of government that we proposed or an alternative. *Refers to copy of proposal by Meg and Nick that summarizes current proposal.*

There are 4 potential options. First option is the mayor-council (current proposal). Second option is a 60-person legislative council, 5-person executive council, manager and mayor. The third option is a council and manager which would involve having a council with 13 members or smaller. The council would be directly elected, hire and supervise the manager. Potential for council to elect chair as political leader (Cambridge model). We discussed it last time but it was uncertain. Could consider it again. *All agree that it's worth discussing further.* The fourth option is a variation of the first option but making a somewhat larger council. Instead of one precinct representative, there would be two representatives. Our goal is to see if there's larger degree of agreement. Another thing on this sheet: info about role of council under mayor-council form and role of council under manager-council form. They have slightly different roles.

Grabbe: People have been encouraging us to seek a compromised proposal since the 5-4 split. Meg and I met 3 times over the past week and tried to come up with something that could possibly bring us together. I have mixed feelings about what we came up with. It's not my first choice among these 4 options, but think it's important to articulate so the public can see it and comment on it and the commission members can debate it. I sought comments about it from 11 people over the last 24 hours. Spoke to Michael Ward about it and there are things in the proposal that are clearly illegal, and other things that are debatable. I will leave it to him to articulate those further. People who are supporting a full time mayor and supporting town meeting will probably not like this, because it doesn't contain either.

Gage: I have five initial points. There are a number of aspects in this that I'm flexible about (certain things like the nature of the veto and so on). I'm eager to hear what's legal and not legal and how constrained we are by Massachusetts law although you can petition legislature. This has been really difficult. We have both alienated people who voted for us, but this isn't an effort to please everybody. This is an effort to solve and address problems we've identified in a way that is more radical. Second point: this proposal supports a full time professional manager. This makes it more popular and likely to pass. Third point: this gets rid of town meeting because it is a quarter of the size. We don't have the regulations of the MGL to control how town meeting should work. By making it a council we have a lot more nimbleness and responsiveness. The executive council can veto the legislative council. That's huge because there's no such thing for town meeting. Fourth: current proposal that only has 5-4 support eliminates meaningful resident participation. The ways they can participate are by attending hearings, filing petitions and complaints and defeating someone in the polls. People don't necessarily know all the details of how an elected person operates. For residents to not have input, I think we'll have civil disobedience. My last point: I was one of the people very disappointed in how the school vote turned out. I see the anger and hear it in meetings. The current charter proposal is going to have rigorous debate about this. I beg our charter commission to address problems in a creative way and maintain voter/resident participation. I feel compelled to try to be creative.

Churchill: Could you give us a 30-second elevator speech describing this proposal?

Gage: This is a proposal of a form of government similar to Cambridge. There's an elected mayor, head of the executive council. There's also a full time manager who's the executive of the town. The mayor would run the executive council and have some veto power. They would represent the town in places where we want someone with stature and credibility like state legislature. There would also be a legislative council of 60 and representatives of each precinct. A 60-person council would create policy with positions that could be vetoed. All of us want an executive council that can focus on strategic planning.

Grabbe: I would assume that certain tasks that the select board currently does, like liquor license, would be done in a different way and not by the executive council.

Rhodes: Before we get into a full discussion, can we find out what is legal and not?

Rueschemeyer: It says here that Meg believes that the mayor should be chosen from within the council. I'm guessing that we will want to discuss how the mayor is chosen.

Grabbe: Meg and I finally agreed that the mayor (which will not be a full-time position) will be selected by the executive council from their membership. If you had an independently elected mayor that was a full-time salaried position, then you would have a proposal with certain questions for who would be. Either way the mayor is in charge of policy.

Rhodes: We really need to know what is legal and illegal about this proposal.

Ward: This does strike me as being relatively different from Cambridge. There's no executive council in Cambridge and the legislative body is 9 elected at large, and the mayor is chosen from within the council, and is chair of the school committee. I would say it's relatively different from the proposal here. Other preface: we are not attorneys, but we have experience in what the attorney general would say and what would pass with mass general laws. Most of the proposal works. The 60 person council works. The most problematic is that it said that sole authority over budgets could go to the executive council. That has to go to the legislative. The other one which I think is really troublesome is that the executive can veto over

the legislative as a council. That ties to the bigger question: the idea of the executive council's existence in general. Our best guess is that the attorney general would find that in conflict of MA general law, but it's possible that we could be wrong in trying to project what the attorney general thinks. It's a grey area because nowhere it says we can't do this. As for the size of the council, 60, nothing legally problematic about that. Having the mayor appointed by the council is fine. The problem is this executive council.

Stein: I wrote to Stan Rosenberg for advice on this 6 weeks ago. David Sullivan, general council for the state senate said that we could do pretty much what we wanted maybe under a special act. I am very concerned that Framingham passed their charter by a 105 votes out of 11,000. Sounds a lot like the school vote. If we can be creative and bring us together it would help a lot.

Weiss: How hard is this to make a turn around if the general attorney says it can't be done?

Ward: It's about 4 weeks that the general attorney has. There's a two month window between when the preliminary report and final report is due. So it could be altered.

Weiss: The attorney general's office said anyone can take it to court any time they want.

Churchill: The legality of it is only one piece.

Gage: You could have a 60 person council?

Rueschemeyer: How important is this 5-member council to your proposal as opposed to a mayor?

Gage: We were thinking about checks and balances. Not opposed to that. Was thinking there needs to be some facilitator person. Need some infrastructure to manage a 60-person council.

Rhodes: The Manager's Association wrote strongly for choosing a manager. I do believe a strong manager is necessary. Whatever we come up with, there has to be a system of checks and balances.

Churchill: Have heard from a number of people that they would be more comfortable with a manager rather than mayor. Heard concern that if there is only one representative from a precinct, they might be only from one side of a divided precinct. I feel that there's likely a number of issues that come up. Personally comfortable with a 13 person council. I think that the role of communication between a councilor and their district is a very important element. Was looking at how Newton is organized. They have a larger council of 24 and a mayor. Seems to me that we could expand the council to have 2 people from each precinct and three at-large to give us a 23-person council which gives us more representation and a variety of opinions. Voters would know who represents them. I think it's important to have the government leaders elected directly by the people. So I'm concerned about the council manager in that the manager is somewhat insulated from the people. They're hired by the council and can only be removed by the council. I like that in the mayor-council model, there is a clear division and direct communication link to the voters. A one-person executive is also able to better have a coherent vision and advocate for the town. For these reasons, I'm less enthusiastic about the options that would have a manager appointed by the council, but if a large majority of the commission would support that option, I would consider joining that vote. Potential for a mayor or manager.

Grabbe: One point that wasn't brought up in option 3 of the handout was that we would largely eliminate the potential criticism of greater influence of money in politics. Will be a serious issue if we go with an independently elected mayor. It's also really important for the people in government who make decisions to be directly accountable to the public. Less important for the people implementing those decisions.

Hanneke: Not sure I can support option 2. Feel really strongly about a unitary executive. That middle ground proposal has a plural executive, which has many problems like the veto issue, harder to hold them accountable to the voters etc. Seriously considering a larger council because it would allow more diversity of ideas. One of my main concerns is not electing at large members.

Fricke: I think that we won't have everyone agree. I think we have a lot of proposals better than the current form of government. I'm still leaning towards a charter commission proposal that goes with the vote that we already had.

Rueschemeyer: I like Meg and Nick's proposal, but don't love it. The 60-person legislative council is a big drop for me in terms of participation from town meeting right now. However, 60 people can better represent a diversity of points. I wouldn't support the current option 1 (mayor-council) and definitely

wouldn't support option 3 (council-manager) but think that a mayor could replace the 5-person executive council. Also like the manager option.

Churchill: Don't see where the majority support is for option 2. It's not clear who the voice is for Amherst. Too many structures and don't know where strategic long term planning would come from. I see citizen participation opening up for the full range of people who don't have time to join town meeting but can come to public forums and be communicated in a better way than we have now. I prefer option 4 because it's more representative and easier to transition from our current town meeting.

Stein: I am for option 2. Willing to be persuaded that the executive council should be substituted by a mayor. I have no problem with the 60-person council and think we need to keep diversity. Many people of color who aren't involved in town politics. Also strongly for a manager. Feel strongly that the education and expertise that a manager could bring to our charter is important.

Rhodes: I could move from a council-manager to option 4 if we had a larger council, because I do believe there's a value in having elected officials who represents various precincts. There's no part of me that would want town meeting to come back, but I do value the deliberative body that is elected. So I could support for a mayor-council. To have a mayor-manager-council, I'm reluctant to go that far. I do not think that it would be a large leap for a mayor to step in and manage departments. I believe that professional management really is a value. Could do a large council (30 or 40).

Gage: The police estimate 38,000 people in Amherst, 10,000 of those are students who are not here year-round. Which means we're 28,000 year-round citizens, which is a really small population to be run by a political leader. I only support the mayor in our proposal because it comes with a large council. I think a lot of people want a mayor. I feel strongly in favor of a professional manager who runs the place. We're hearing from other towns that it's really tricky to have a mayor in a small place that doesn't have a lot of candidates, but I agreed to it in our proposal. Feel strongly that a mayor is a mistake.

Weiss: Early on when we met, we had a goal-setting session. I said my goal for this commission was to create a charter that stands the chance of bridging the divide in this town. We currently have chaos and disagreements. I don't feel for sure that some kind of bridge proposal is going to solve the problem. I don't believe though that 50.5% of the population gets everything they want. Citizen power and town meeting is the most important to me. Any way to have a 60-person council sounds better for me. Will not go below 60. I think that voting does not make people feel like they have power.

Churchill asking for public comment.

Jerry Guidera, precinct 9: This feels like a long discussion of a proposal that's never going to fly anyhow. Not sure why this is the third or fourth time that we're looking at a different option when it has already been voted on 5 or 6 times. At this point, this effort to build consensus is irrelevant and useless because people are going to vote based on how they feel about the proposal.

Michael Greenebaum: I think that the proposal that Meg and Nick crafted is an ingenious and strong proposal. I think it's important for the charter commission to confront this. You want a mayor or someone with a unitary vision. What does that mean for a town for Amherst? I'm not sure what this vision is. You talk about have a clear vision in a town that is divided in many ways. Strongly support option 2. Don't think a legislative council could provide real supervision and evaluation.

Alice Swift: A 60-person council would get the opportunity for discussion. That's what was missing at town meeting. Strongly support this proposal from Nick and Meg and support the idea of having citizen participation. Would allow more people to get involved.

Michael Hanke: There are a couple political sayings that come to mind: We have nothing to fear but fear itself. There's a lot of fear here. I have concerns here about change. I voted for people on this committee that I thought would be open for real change. It bothers me that things are changing for the worse.

Frustrated that I can't vote the town manager out. A professional town manager is a good idea, but they should be subservient of a council and mayor. Advocate for a strong mayor.

Kitty Axelson-Berry: I don't trust people who are vying for power to want to accrue more power. I think that Amherst is bigger than arguing and fighting with each other. We need to have participation by all people. I don't think that town meeting even takes that long. I appreciate your spirit of compromise and agree that larger is better.

Melissa Giraud: Was frustrated by the school vote as we saw the school proposal voted down. There are many young parents like me who don't feel represented. I push back against Diana's suggestion that we would have more representation with 60. We wouldn't, because a lot of us won't be able to do it while having jobs and kids. I want a vision for this town and want it to include young families.

Adrienne Terrizzi: Several things come to mind. Option 2 brings together a kind of comfort. I want to applaud Nick and Meg. It's a re-draft of something that appeals to issues of legislative function, executive function and professional management. I think it can be tweaked but is a great start. Hope it's at least a 7+ vote that you can bring to us. I hear so much uninformed and misinformed info of who sets things in town. There's a lot of confusion. Once you do choose a plan and draft of what you come up with, please do a great campaign.

Ted Parker: Amherst has a lot of unacknowledged structural problems. Four major capital projects that haven't been addressed for decades, a school system that has been declining in enrollment, fewer young families with children in town, the school population is decreasing. This is because the structure of the government isn't able to address the challenges that we have. Having a more responsive form of government is important. Very few young families with children support the current form of government or town meeting. A directly elected mayor is accountable. This chase for unanimity of consensus is a chase after something that isn't possible. Town meeting survived on 14 votes, with a very slim majority.

Karla Rasche: Precinct 6. Want to comment on size of option 2 with 60 members, which is unwieldy. Some of you may not realize that if you call your town representatives and they disagree with you, sometimes they listen, sometimes they hang up on you, and sometimes they yell at you. That's not a representative. A 60-member council would diffuse responsibility. I think we need to keep it smaller. I agree that there's a systemic problem in our country that not enough people vote, but I don't think we can discount the power of being participatory by voting. Our 240-member town meeting is not diverse and does not represent our different socioeconomic groups. We need to take a bold step forward and this is not the way to go.

Hwei-Ling Greeney: After moving from Taiwan to Amherst, I was able to express myself by writing a column to be a part of politics. Was very happy that I could say something. I've run for select board and town meeting. In that process, I really feel that in order to allow citizens to feel empowered and have a voice, it's really the number that matters. The number of 60 is good. I want to agree with Gerry Weiss that anything less than 60 is a bad idea. Need to have diversity, and 13 members is too small.

Maurianne Adams: Very sorry about the rudeness of some members of town meeting who hang up and yell at constituents. Want to add that vision and leadership are very important, but there is no single vision in this town on any single issue, nor can they be. It's because we all live in a town with many pressing issues and have different points of view. I require a minimum of a 60-person council because diversity is crucial.

Alisa Brewer: I am upset by a whole lot. People are demanding a minimum of 60 people when you don't know what you're asking. There has been no vetting by you of who those 60 people will be. Town

meeting is not diverse, and you will have to make sure that 60 people are diverse. When you only have 60, there will probably be peer pressure to do work. Where are you going to find those 60 people? The reason people like this so much is because they don't know how it will work. Please don't say that it has to be 60 because you don't know the details yet.

Janet Keller: Precinct 1. There is no way to ensure however many people you have, that they will be as diverse that we would like to have. Urge you to consider a number that will at least allow diversity. Professional management is extremely important. I want to see an option that has that in it.

Jackie Churchill: Hope you all hear some of the refrains tonight. We're going to disagree and have divisions. Addressing the middle ground proposal: we're not sure of the full legalities and voters are looking for clarity.

Claudia Brown: I witnessed just how divided the town is about the two extreme sides. Option 2 is the best thing that I've heard so far. I'm really interested in learning more about it. Brings a lot to the table and the other options would continue with the extremes.

Janet McGowan: Member of town meeting. *Referring to the divisions and tensions within school votes.* Having a proposal with a lot of people behind it in town is better for the voters.

Shevan Best Really appreciate Meg and Nick's proposal. Whatever the legalities are, this answers a lot of questions. I like this approach because even if there was a mayor, it wouldn't give them total top-down power. Really happy about option 2.

Josh Hornick: My big question: how do you design a charter that encourages people to work together? I really like the 5-person executive council because I know that trying to bring in different opinions is very hard. A group of 6 or 7 who's thinking that we're trying to come to an agreement together, a group of that size can do it.

Bob Greeney: Worth noting how diverse this body is and what a rich array of options they've come up with. This is the kind of dialogue and work that I value in this town. I am absolutely in favor of option 2.

Christopher Riddle: Town Meeting Coordinating Committee. If I couldn't have town meeting, I support Meg and Nick's proposal.

Markus Smith: You need more structure with 60 people than you need with a smaller body. You're not going to get quality discussion with 60 people. The smaller the better within reason. Option 4 is probably that middle ground so people are held accountable.

Michael Albert: Would like you to flesh out the distinction between the chief administrative officer and manager.

Break.

Churchill: Would like to know which of these options have the potential of getting a larger consensus right now. Not quite sure we all have the same understanding of option 2.

Rueschemeyer: Motion to discuss option 2 with tweaks. *Passed.* Suggestion: keep the 60 person council, replace 5-person executive council with a mayor, have a manager either supervised by the mayor or supervised by the council. Need to discuss who appoints the manager.

Ward: Semantic suggestion. When dividing the term weak mayor and strong mayor, a weak mayor being ceremonial coming out of a council like Cambridge's model. A strong mayor would be full-time independently elected.

Gage: Nick and I proposed a ceremonial mayor who comes out of the council. We talked about a 60-person council, which would need some thought about how it would be managed.

Talk about a strong mayor, council of 60, COO supervised by a mayor. Starting to look like option 4 with a bigger council.

Fricke: The best 60-person council would be one which was balanced by a strong mayor. The greatest danger with such a council is diffusion of responsibility.

Stein: I want a strong manager too but not sure how that would work. Not sure that a COO would be strong enough.

Grabbe: What would we gain with a manager that we would not gain with a COO?

Ward: Let's differentiate here with what you want the person to do and what their title should be. In terms of perception, the title is important. You want someone who has professional experience, credentials, a background who will manage the day-to-day operations under the policy direction of an elected mayor who is accountable to the voters. With that in mind, you could craft a job description in the charter, but you could craft some sentences about the positions that point to the direction of what the role is.

Grabbe: I think one of the advantages of a COO as opposed to a manager is that there would be no doubt who is in charge. It would be the mayor.

Stein: I want some restriction on the mayor. That's why I want more balance.

Churchill: Restriction on the mayor would be the council. Appointments would have to be approved, policies ratified, can veto what they come up with etc.

Stein: I would like a balance between the two. Like Kansas city's structure of a manager and mayor.

Hanneke: Kansas city has a mayor elected separately from the city council. The city manager is responsible to both the mayor and the city council for proper administration of all affairs of the city. The duties of the mayor: official head of the city, the state of the city address, appointing all members of board and committees. The city council is the legislature. *Explains in detail.*

Gage: I don't support not having paragraph 3 and the nonpartisan professional town management position. Think that the proposal with option 2 is preferable. *Further clarification and discussion with Rhodes.*

Ward: Trying to think about accountability. Mayor will be seen by the public as responsible.

Hanneke: Don't think it's feasible to have a manager report to a 60 person council.

Churchill: Two options. It either has to be a directly elected mayor or a smaller council.

Rhodes: When I hear 60 people, it doesn't sound right. However, I can look at it and think that it might fit in Amherst' environment with a directly elected mayor and a professional manager. I don't see how 60 people can supervise one person.

Grabbe: Key question. Who would supervise the employees?

Rhodes: If it's a manager, the manager supervises.

Stein: Agree that the manager supervises the town employees.

Churchill: If the mayor is going to be held accountable by the people, they need to have some sort of control over who's doing the work.

Fricke: I'm not in favor but I think you have a better model than when you started.

Grabbe: Diane, by saying you want a manager, do you mean that you don't want a mayor to supervise employees?

Stein: Yes. I also believe strongly that a manager brings professional expertise. Also wanted to say that in a 60 person council, there would be opportunity for discussion which is important.

Churchill: It sounds like the distinctions between these are starting to blur. We're getting closer to option 1 and 4 with a larger council. You have a directly elected mayor, a council of 60, a chief administrative

officer reporting to a mayor and neighborhood meetings. I do have concerns about a 60 person council. To be able to deliberate and attest assertions, I'm not sure that it should be 60. It's too big a body to be effective. If you were going to add subcommittees, then you'd be setting up barriers for people participating.

Rueschemeyer: With a 60 person council, not everyone is going to be interested in the same subjects. The conversations would be multifaceted in different groups. You're meeting once a month, so there would be more opportunity for conversation over the course of the year.

Churchill: More concerned with the quality of deliberation. Why are we saying 60 people as opposed to 30 or a different number?

Gage: Because we're trying to reach an agreement for those who were supporters of town meeting.

Churchill: This is bigger than NYC's council.

Hanneke: A 60 person council would be the largest in the nation for a municipality. Right now NYC is the largest at 55. I believe that the next largest might be 51 in Chicago, but then it's 35 and below. I don't think I can support a 60 person council. The deliberation would have to take place in the subcommittees and I'm not sure that's what we want. That would mimic more likely town meeting. It would require a hierarchical form of structure in order to operate. A 60-member council allows councilors to hide and not show up and do the work.

Gage: With a 13 person council, they also have committees. *Giving examples of conjectures of things that can go wrong.*

Ward: Back in the executive... One of the key things that you have to figure out is whose budget is it, who drafts it and who carries the budget to the council. In the current draft of the charter it's the mayor's budget.

Show of hands: how many people would want to have a directly elected mayor (by the people) who appoints the manager who has to directly report to that mayor? 6 votes.

Fricke: Do we have a new majority for a 60-person council? Should count that.

Weiss: Motion to vote for a 60-member council, with a directly elected mayor by the people, who appoints the manager. *Rueschemeyer seconds.*

Churchill: Let's discuss the motion.

Stein: I can support a directly elected mayor under certain circumstances. I would support this.

Hanneke: I can't support 60. We haven't discussed whether they would all be at large or all be precincts and if all that matters.

Stein: I think we could juggle that. I've heard arguments about having fewer precinct reps and more at-large reps. I don't think that's built into this.

Rhodes: What the make up of that 60 will be is irrelevant. We're voting on the size.

Churchill: I would vote against this motion. Think we need a smaller council to be more deliberative. Open to somewhat unwieldy group, but this is too unwieldy.

Rueschemeyer: It sounds like there are people who are not going to vote on anything smaller. So the idea of trying to come up with a middle way is gone if we don't have a 60 person council.

All in favor of motion: 5 (Weiss, Gage, Rhodes, Stein and Rueschemeyer)

Churchill: Where we are now: we have a mayor, a 60-member council, and a chief administrative officer reporting to the mayor. We'll build the details around that.

Stein: Question for Mike about the way to proceed. I'd like to know what you think should happen next.

Ward: The biggest thing to tackle is the proportion of at-large and district councilors, and the length of terms of the councilors, and need to delineate what the COO position is.

Rhodes: Also power and duties of the directly elected mayor. I also have no idea how this 60 person council is going to do anything. Can look at Chicago and NYC's structures and see how they organize it.

Discussion of next meetings and feedback sessions.

Churchill adjourned the meeting at 9:30 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Fiona Servaes

Documents presented:

Potential Definitions and General Provisions to Include in Charter
Grabbe-Gage Middle Ground Proposal of 4/5/2017